

SECRET

Re: ZHURKOV, Pimen Gordayevich *See Page 3 for b6*

Date: 20 August 1965

Source: *See Page 3 for b7c*

1. Subject approached source after the International Talent Show which was held in Hall of Nations, Georgetown University 20 August 1965. Subject was with KLYEPATSKIY, Nikolay, (a teacher from Belorussia) and KOZLOV, Petr (from Alma-Ata).
2. Subject asked what are the colors of the Ukrainian flag used by the emigration, and what is the Ukrainian national symbol used by emigration. Source explained that the flag is blue-yellow, and the symbol is the trident (TRIZUB). Subject seemed familiar with these symbols, but continued by asking what national holidays are celebrated by the Ukrainian emigration. Source explained that there are a few, the main being 1 November 1918, and 22 January 1918. Source elaborated that these days commemorated the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, the first in Lviv, and the second in Kiev. Subj wanted to know if this happened during the regime of Petlura in Ukraine. Source confirm this, and asked why subject was so interested all of a sudden in Ukrainian national holidays. Subject answered that it was interesting for him to know, and went on by ask how these holidays are celebrated, and who attends them. Subject explained that most Ukrainians attend, there are a few speeches, the national anthem *Sob Shabo No Vmerla Ukraine* is sung, sometimes an amateur dance group performs. On the whole this is a solemn ceremony celebrated mainly for the youth to pass on the tradition of the past. Subject asked if there was any merry making and drinking after the formalities., because in Ukraine this is the custom. Source said no, that this is not the occasion for such. Subject wanted to know if there is a commemoration of the death of 300 members of the Komsomol who were killed by Petlura's men in Ukraine. Source was not familiar with this event, and replied *what were they doing there in the first place*, adding that the emigration celebrates the massacre of Ukrainian students at KIEV by the Red ar. Subject replied that the Komsomol was fighting for a free Ukraine, when asked who gave them the right, subject said the people did. source told subject to read more history

1.

*Aug 20 Al Dury
9 Sept*

SECRET

broken, and he would see that in 1918 when there were elections to the central government and the Central Rada received the majority of the votes. Subject did not answer and stopped the topic.

3. Subject attacked U.S.A. by saying that it did not support the USSR during the war and the Soviet Union was forced to fight the war alone against Germany. When source asked about the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, subject became angry and said that it was only a maneuver on the part of the USSR. Source then commented that the U.S. gave the USSR 11 billion dollars of lend-lease aid, which included gasoline, trucks, food, medicine and clothes, which was never repaid, only the Soviet government gave the U.S. an informal ~~and~~ scroll of thanks. Subject became angry at this statement and raised his voice, calling that he was deeply insulted by this, and that money cannot buy back human lives. Koval told subject that he was an idiot, since America gave the USSR money, not to buy back lives, but to save them, and if he didn't believe this he should go to hell. Koval started to defend source gently by saying that it was not all black and white during the war. At this subject looked at Koval sternly and said that he had to go, and left. Source walked away with Koval and Koval stayed.

Soviet Teachers Exchange Group at Georgetown Uni., 1965

Re: ZELENSKY, Pimon

Source: ~~Recd. 12 August 1965~~/57

Date: 13 August 1965

ZELENSKY, Pimon

1. ZELENSKY, Pimon; Nationality Ukrainian, born in Alokayevka, Shkopoli Rayon, Ukraine in 1919. Chairman of the Department of English Philology in Lviv University. Has been in Lviv University from 1945. Graduated from Kharkiv Pedagogical Inst. of Foreign Languages in 1940. ZELENSKY is one of the leaders of the group of teachers that visited Georgetown University summer 1965. He is 6'2", 180 lbs, well built, dark hair, likes to talk and attacks U.S. frequently in conversation. Is a "comedian" by nature, frequently attacking Ukrainian nationalism, role of U.S. in world war 2, etc. Subject dresses like a typical tourist from the USSR, wearing dark shirts, and heavy jackets.
2. Contact was made in the lobby of Hartin Hall in Georgetown University by source, with source approaching subject saying that he read in Washington papers that there was a group of teachers on exchange from the USSR in Georgetown University and since his (subject's) name was in the paper, source wanted to talk with him. Subject seemed happy to talk, and went outside with source.
3. Source asked if he was familiar with STADNIKOVICH, a teacher that source had met the previous year at Cornell University, who also is from Lviv University. Subject was familiar with him, and said that presently he has finished his examinations, and will remain in Lviv University. Subject seemed surprised at the fact that source knew him, and was caught off guard.
4. Source asked if it was possible to study in Lviv University for a year at the present time, and how he should go about doing it. Subject did not soon seize on the formal procedures, saying that it was possible, but that source would have to turn to his government for a formal request. This did not satisfy source and he asked if he could study privately in the University. He was told this by subject that at the present time this was out of the question since the relations of the two governments were strained.

3.

But there were many students from different countries in Lviv University at the present time, and subject expects that soon there would be an exchange program with the U.S.

5. Subject asked what source is studying. When told that it was history, with concentration on the Soviet Union, subject seemed surprised and wanted to know how Soviet history is taught in the U.S. and if there is any objectivity at all. Source explained that he frequently uses Soviet textbooks for reference in addition to books written by American scholars. Subject did not believe this and attacked source by stating that Soviet history in America is taught only in its negative aspects, while the achievements of the Soviet regime are completely ignored. Source took exception to this, asking if he as a student should only use Soviet textbooks, and sources. Subject said "yes, of course", adding that ^{they} were the only objective sources on Soviet history. Source objected to this statement arguing that Soviet history books are written to satisfy the current line of the party, and to please the current leadership. An example given was a comparison of the first Soviet Encyclopedia written during the Stalin era, and the current edition. Source went on to say that it was almost impossible to learn the truth from either edition. One praised Stalin, Beria, Kaganovich and others as great leaders of the party and wise followers of Lenin, and in the new edition Stalin is pictured as an idiot, while Beria and Kaganovich is not even mentioned. Subject replied that this book was written during the period of the personality cult and cannot be considered valid. When asked which book can be considered valid and accurate historically, subject did not answer directly but laughed, saying that all the modern books are good. When told that if he examined the new history texts he would find a large passage about Khrushchev which prunes him to no end, while presently Khrushchev is considered a man who made quite a few mistakes, and has a "rabbit brain". Subject did not answer those charges instead started attacking the role of the U.S. in world war two, saying that the U.S. abandoned the USSR, and the USSR had to face the German invaders alone. Subject praised the Red Army for taking Berlin, saying that this action was done by the Red Army alone. When source countered by stating that the U.S. gave the USSR 11 billion dollars in aid, which was never repaid, subject became quite angry, and said that money will never buy back honor. Source told subject that he is

misinformed and should read Churchill's History of World War II. Source went on to say that the U.S. suffered severely against Japan, and if the U.S. did not drop atom bombs the U.S.A. would have lost the war. Subject did not want to listen to source's arguments, telling him that he was still young and should read more history books.

6. When asked about life in Ukraine, subject gave the usual rehearsed speech that Ukraine was completely destroyed during the war, and now has completely rebuilt. When asked about certain inequities in the Soviet system, nationality policy, Russification, equality of Republics, subject gave party line answers, there is no Russification, all republics are equal, Ukraine is a free nation. There subject responded to questions very aggressively, attacking Ukrainian nationalists who collaborated with the Germans during World War 2. Subject kept repeating that Ukrainians in the U.S. are only a certain Shultz in Ukraine, and dismissed all good achievements of the Soviet regime. Source countered by saying that only a small group of Ukrainians looked at Ukraine in this way, the majority saw both the achievements and the shortcomings of the regime, but the shortcomings were very harsh. Source went on to say that the main complaint about the Soviet regime was Russification in Ukraine. Subject again denied that such a policy is being practiced, that in Ukraine, Ukrainian is being spoken all the time, and Ukrainian culture is flourishing. Source saw there was no use arguing with subject and changed the topic.

7. Asked if there is a possibility of rehabilitation of Kryshevsky, subject replied negatively, saying that Kryshevsky was a nationalist and such people are considered wrong by the Soviet Union. Source brought up question that if Kryshevsky is forbidden, then why is Klyuchevsky allowed? Subject did not answer but said that he is not familiar with history too well. Subject seemed uncomfortable with some of source's questions but source continued along same line, asking if there might be rehabilitations of other famous Ukrainians who were destroyed by Stalin, writers like HRYHORIV, the anti-party organization VILNIK, and so forth. Subject did not want to commit himself to a definite answer saying that such matters rested with high party officials.

8. Subject stated that Khrushov was removed due to old age and certain slights on his

agriculture. Subject stuck to story that Khrushchev was reelected loyalty and there was no coup ~~that~~ in the Kremlin. Khrushchev did begin to form a personality cult around himself in his later years, said subject had this had to be received. Source did not accept this last statement, saying that it was hard to believe, because Khrushchev himself imposed Staline cult to the people. Subject did not answer, source attacked Stalin and the exposure of the cult by saying if only a handful of people Stalin, Krushchev, Beria and Vorov, were responsible for the terror of the period, and if Khrushchev was not involved in any way in that period of time. Subject did not know. When asked who elected Stalin, subject replied that the party did, then source attacked the party for its lack of responsibility in electing such a man its leader. This enraged subject and he started to defend Stalin and his rule saying that Stalin did very much good for the country, put it on its feet after the war, and collectivized the farms. Source retorted that the forced collectivization led to famine and a loss of millions of lives. Subject did not believe this, saying that this was a lie. Source saw that it was useless to argue with subject further, and decided to end the discussion. They parted as friends having the usual drink.